Preliminary Enquiry Report of the Enquiry Officer

No. KB/EO/285/66-67, dated 6th Septmber 1966.

A preliminary enquiry was conducted into the misappropriation of the funds of the Board in the Gur and Khandasari Section. Out of 16 cases, 14 vouchers were handed over to me. Apart from this, vouchers were also not available for the advance of Rs. 22 paid to Sri V. S. Hiregoudar to make good at the District Office on 16th August 1961 (item 5), the advance of Rs. 44 outstanding against Sri V. S. Hiregowdar towards the food charges, paid at the time of farewell to Sri G. V. Hallikere during September 1960 (item 8), the advance of Rs. 25 paid to Sri Y. S. Kalwad as per instructions of the Gur Development Officer on 7th October 1961 (item 10), the advance of Rs. 20 paid to Sri Manik Rao Kalburgi, Superintendent, Establishment Section as per instruction of the Gur Development Officer during 1960 (item 12). The amount of Rs. 61-50 deposited at Tourist Hotel towards reservation of rooms for the delegates attending the Gur Development Officers' Conference on 11th July 1961 (item 13) and the T. A. advance of Rs. 2 paid to Sri Sitharam and Sri Puttaswamy class IV officials to go to K. R. Puram on 20th April 1962 (item 16).

Sriyuths B. Srikanthaiah, M. A. Subbaiah, Manik Rao Kalburgi and peons Puttaswamy, Lingaiah and Seetharam were examined at the enquiry. Sri V. S. Hiregowdar was not present at the enquiry.

Sri B. Srikanthaiah deposed that he did not remember for which purpose he took the advance of Rs. 60. It might be for travelling expenses. He had to take the money urgently and he took the permission of Sri Hiregowdar for taking cash. Subsequently it had been paid back. But the amount had not been spent for his personal use.

Sri M. A. Subbaiah said that he used to disburse the advances to various parties on the instructions of Sri V. S. Hiregowdar, Gur Development Officer. There were no written orders to issue advances. He added that by the end of March 1963, the amounts outstanding had been recovered from the parties and so far as he was concerned, he had nothing to pay and had no hand in the payment of advances, except obeying the orders of his superior officer, Sri Hiregowdar. He was not responsible in any way. It was Sri Hiregowdar, who was responsible for the advances. He did not give advances to anybody on his own accord.

Sri Manik Rao Kalburgi stated that he borrowed Rs. 20 from Sri Subbaiah of Gur and Khandasari Section. It was later on returned to him. He had not borrowed from Sri Hiregowdar. He said that he had not taken any advance. As he wanted money, he had taken it from Sri Subbaiah. He did not know that Sri Subbaiah was handling cash. He returned the loan which was given by Sri Subbaiah.

(SRI A. P. APPANNA)

Sri Puttaswamy peon, stated that the advance of Rs. 20 was given to Sri Lingaiah and he gave the acknowledgement to Sri Subbaiah. Sri Hiregowdar had asked Sri Subbaiah to give advance. Himself and Sri Lingaiah were asked to keep Rs. 10 each for their expenses at the Visvesvaraya Museum.

Sri Lingaiah, peon, corroborated the evidence of Sri Puttaswamy. He said that Rs. 20 had been given to him and Sri Puttaswamy for their food expenses at the Exhibition at the Visveswaraya Museum. This advance had been given to them on the instructions of Sri Hiregowdar.

Sri Seetharam, peon, who worked at the Exhibition said that he received Rs. 1-50 per day for his duty. Sri Hiregowdar was advancing him money through Sri V. Raghuram. He remembered to have taken advance of Rs. 30 and Rs. 15 for which he had given acknowledgement. Regarding the advance of Rs. 2 to go to K. R. Puram to see the Sugar cane crushing Machine, the acknowledgement for Rs. 2 had not been taken from either of them.

Conclusion :—Regarding the advances referred to above, it is a fact that Sri Hiregowdar took the advances since he was handling cash. He must have spent the money with the idea of reimbursing it later, since he was also the Drawing Officer.

In respect of the advance of Rs. 22 paid to Sri Hiregowdar to make good at the District Office, Rs. 10 as payment to the Advocate appearing for the Housing Society and Rs. 44 towards food charges, there is no doubt that Sri Hiregowdar exceeded his authority. He should not have paid the money from funds of the Board.

Regarding the advances of Rs. 25 and Rs. 20 to Sri Y. H. Klawad and Sri Manik Rao Kalburgi, it is not known for what purpose he paid the advances. In the absence of vouchers, it is not possible to say anything. Sri Manik Rao Kalburgi, flatly denied having received anything as advance. It was something like a loan which he took from Sri Subbaiah. There is no voucher relating to the amount of Rs. 61-50 deposited at the Tourist Hotel.

Items 2 and 3 refer to the advances of Rs. 45 and Rs. 25 taken by Sri Hiregowdar. He should have paid back the advances while claiming the final T. A. bill. His failure to do so is a serious lapse of duty on his part. Other advances taken by him adverted to under items 1, 4, 7, 9, and 10 are equally open to objection.

As regards, point (*b*), depositing the funds of the Board in the personal name, the Canara Bank in their letter dated 18th May 1965 have confirmed that the Bank account was in the name of Sri V. S. Hiregowdar, Development Officer, Gur nd Khandasari Industry, Bangalore. Action should have been taken earlier to see that he did not keep any account in his personal name. It was an irregularity.

With regard to point (*c*), that Sri Hiregowdar had drawn the salary for the period for which even leave was not sanctioned, the note of the Ex-Office Manager dated 21st July 19 64 has been seen as also the reply of Sri V. S. Hiregowdar dated 29th July 1964. The arguments and counter-arguments have proceeded on personal lines and do not throw much light.

Lastly about (*d*), the copy of the representation given to the Convener of the Enquiry Committee by the officials of the Board against Sri V. S. Hiregowdar, Secretary of the Housing Co-operative Society, has not been made available.

It appears from above that the advances paid by Sri V. S. Hiregowdar have also been recovered and the question of taking further action does not arise, since he is no longer in service.

The transactions were irregular and Sri Hiregowdar should have exercised sufficient care to see that his over-enthusiasm did not outrun the bounds of prudence and elementary rules of office procedure. There are no amounts outstanding against him. No action is called for.

(Sd.) B. Channabasavappa,
Enquiry Officer.

Petition regarding levy on Jawar Crop submitted by the ryots of Aland Taluk

Presentation.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR (Aland).—Sir. I present a petition signed by the ryots of Aland Taluk requesting for exemption from levy on jawar crop.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The petition is presented.

City of Bangalore Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 1969.

Motion to Consider

Sri B. M. PATIL (Minister of State for Municipal Administration).—Sir, I beg to move.....

† Sri M. NAGAPPA (Raichur).—Sir, I take objection to the moving of this Bill. My objection is only to clause 10 of the Bill which seeks to insert section 104A in the original Act. It deals with apportionment of liability for property tax when the premises assessed are let or sub-let. Under this provision, if any premises assessed to property tax is